

REMARKS

Claims 1-18 are pending. Claims 1, 3-5, 7-10, and 17 have been amended and new claim 18 has been added to recite additional features of the embodiments disclosed in the specification.

In the Office Action, claims 1-4, 7-11, and 13 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) for being obvious in view of a Bennefeld-Galasso combination. Applicants request the Examiner to withdraw this rejection for the following reasons.

Claim 1 recites performing two types of redundancy in a communication system. The first type of redundancy is performed by at least one alternative gatekeeper for or within each of a plurality of sub-zones. The second type of redundancy is performed based on “a pass between the sub-zones to provide redundancy for setting up a call.” This second type of redundancy is not taught or suggested by the cited references.

The Bennefeld patent, for example, discloses a communication system partitioned into a plurality of zones. Each zone includes master and standby gatekeepers which provide redundancy in and only in that zone. (See Figure 5B). However, Bennefeld does not teach or suggest a pass that exists between the zones to be used for providing redundancy for setting up a call between the zones. Rather, the gatekeepers in each zone of Bennefeld merely communicate with a root gatekeeper 550A, 550B via separate communication paths.

Moreover, Bennefeld does not teach or suggest the additional features relating to the second type of redundancy recited in claim 1, including that “the pass includes one or more

routes between the sub-zones which provide call set-up redundancy based on location request (LRQ) signaling.”

Further, claim 1 recites that the LRQ signaling includes at least one of “transmitting a location confirm (LCF) message from a gatekeeper in a first sub-zone to a gatekeeper in a second sub-zone, the LCF message including at least one of information indicating that the gatekeeper in the first sub-zone is available to set up the call or address information corresponding to one or more alternative gatekeepers in the first sub-zone” or “transmitting a location rejection (LRJ) message from the gatekeeper in the first sub-zone to the gatekeeper in the second sub-zone, the gatekeeper in the second sub-zone updating information to indicate that the gatekeeper in the first sub-zone is unavailable to set up the call.” These features are also not found in the Bennefeld patent.

The Galasso patent was cited for disclosing a master gatekeeper which uses a customer database to map telephone numbers to a zone gatekeeper. However, Galassa does not teach or suggest the features added by amendment to claim 1 that define how the second type of redundancy is performed.

Absent a teaching or suggestion of these features, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 and its dependent claims are allowable over a Bennefeld-Galasso combination.

Claim 7 also recites performing two types of redundancy, where the second type of redundancy is based on a pass between sub-zones. The “pass includes one or more routes between the sub-zones which provide call set-up redundancy based on location request (LRQ)

signaling, said second redundancy being performed based on information contained in at least one predetermined field of a location confirm (LCF) message or a location rejection (LRJ) message transmitted between alternative gatekeepers in the sub-zones.” These features are not taught or suggested by the cited references, whether taken alone or in combination.

Accordingly, it is submitted that claim 7 and its dependent claims are allowable.

Many of the dependent claims were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) based on Bennefeld and Galasso taken in combination with various secondary references. The rejections of these claims is traversed on grounds that the secondary references do not teach or suggest the features added by amendment to base claims 1 and 7.

New claim 18 has been added to the application.

Claim 18 recites providing second redundancy of at least one route for a pass between the sub-zones, the second redundancy provided by performing “heartbeat polling between alternative gatekeepers in order to check whether the master gatekeeper is operating normally, wherein said heartbeat polling is performed based on transmission of a non-standard H.323 message.” (See, for example, Paragraph [43] of the specification for support). The Galasso patent does not teach or suggest performing heartbeat polling between alternative gatekeepers using a non-standard H.323 message, and neither do any of the other references of record. Accordingly, it is submitted that claim 18 is allowable.


Serial No. 10/743,803
Amdt. dated December 21, 2007
Reply to Office Action of August 21, 2007

Docket No. SI-0053

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and timely allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR § 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
KED & ASSOCIATES, LLP



Daniel Y. J. Kim
Registration No. 36,186

Samuel W. Ntiros
Registration No. 39,318

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
703 766-3777
Date: December 21, 2007

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610